

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION MANAGEMENT
AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF DECEMBER 15, 2003**

At 3:01 p.m., Chairman Marland Townsend called the meeting to order in Conference Room C of San Mateo City Hall.

Members Attending: Duane Bay, Jim Bigelow, Tom Davids, Linda Larson, Sue Lempert, Arthur Lloyd, Karyl Matsumoto, Lennie Roberts, Toni Stein, Marland Townsend, and Onnolee Trapp.

Staff/Guests Attending: Geoffrey Kline and Sandy Wong (C/CAG Staff - County Public Works), Pat Dixon (Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee), Richard Napier (C/CAG Executive Director), David Nelson (The Alliance), Bruce Balshowc (JPB-CAC), Howard Goode and Joe Hurley (SMCTA), Richard Cook (SamTrans), Marc Roddin (MTC), Matt Grocott (San Carlos).

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

- None.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes of September 29, 2003 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes as presented. Bigelow/Lempert, unanimous.

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Response to comments on the draft 2003 CMP and recommendation to adopt the 2003 Final CMP.

Geoff Kline summarized that a total of three sets of comments were received on the draft 2003 CMP. Those comments were from MTC, City of Redwood City, and Caltrans. Changes to the draft 2003 CMP have been made based on the comments from MTC and the City of Redwood City. However, since the comments from Caltrans were received after the close of the review period, responses to the Caltrans comments were handed out during the meeting. Sandy Wong went over the some of those comments and responses. Some of the discussions generated were:

- What would be the penalty if San Mateo County raises the Level of Service (LOS) standards? For example, the LOS standard for El Camino Real has been set at "E" since 1991. Since monitoring results showed LOS better than "E", should we change the standard to better than "E"? Philosophically, members do want to strive for higher

standards as well as achieving and maintaining them. However, we would also be vulnerable to being in violation of future degradation of the new standards, and we may not have the money needed to mitigate the violation(s). Geoff Kline further explained that the total available federal and state monies is more or less independent from the number and severity of our CMP network roads/intersections being in violation.

- Some members felt that there was a dilemma in having “F” as one of the LOS standards because it seems to say that “F” is acceptable and that we don’t need to do anything to improve it. Yet, setting a higher standard may not be financially feasible. A brief discussion took place regarding whether we should have a gradation of “F” in order to illustrate impacts due to land use changes. Rich Napier explained that our Land Use Guidelines actually go above and beyond mitigating land use impacts on “F” segments. In fact, the Land Use Guidelines require mitigation if the threshold is triggered, regardless of the LOS.
- Chairman Townsend reminded the group that the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) is the long range plan that sets the goals and vision of where we want to be, whereas the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is a program that is used as a tool to help us achieve the goals and vision.
- Member Stein suggested changing the statement on page 6-3 to require local jurisdictions to notify CCAG at the beginning of the CEQA process rather than at the end of the process with regard to development applications or land use policy changes.
- Member Bay suggested that the LOS standards issue be agendized in a future meeting to assist in the review and update of the Land Use Guidelines. The issue of credits for mitigation of the land use policy also needs to be addressed.

Motion: To accept and forward the 2003 CMP to CCAG with changes to page 6-3 to read “Local jurisdictions will notify C/CAG at the beginning of the CEQA process of all development applications or land use policy changes that ~~will~~ are expected to generate a net 100 or more peak period trips...”, per member Stein’s comment. Bigelow/Stein, all in favor, Bay opposed.

4. Ramp Metering Study Presentation of preliminary results

This item has been deferred to a future meeting.

5. TAC recommendations on reauthorization of Measure A.

- Based on request from members in the September meeting, Geoff Kline handed out the Highway Project Scoring Matrix. The Transit Matrix was handed out in the last meeting and has not been changed.
- Howard Goode and Joe Hurley presented the preliminary analysis of the Measure “A” Continuation. Howard said that the program must serve three masters: 1) must effectively address congestion, 2) must be appealing to the general public (the voters), 3) must gain consensus from public agencies.
- Howard presented the process used thus far to put together the proposed Measure “A”. The financial need exceeds the projected revenues by about three times. The preliminary recommendation, from the technical standpoint, is to divide the relative program shares

(Transit, Highway, Grade Separation, Bicycle/Pedestrian) based on need.

- Member Lempert suggested that the project cost estimates need refinement to reflect more realistic estimates. Joe Hurley said that they are going to hire a consultant to review/refine the cost estimates.
- Member Matsumoto wants more transit in Measure “A”.
- Member Trapp suggested the matrix columns could show a better interpretation.
- Member Stein commented that project controversies should be entered into the Project Scoring Matrix as a separate column. She also wants “roadway” to be better defined.
- Pat Dixon stated that many elderly and handicapped citizens will need to use non-motorized facilities; hence, there will be significant needs in that category. She is working with MTC to ensure adequate funding will be included in the Transportation 2030 Plan.
- Member Davids was concerned that the Bike/Ped program of 3% seems small. That might be due to a lack of long term planning in the non-motorized transportation arena. Howard Goode stated that the Bike/Ped program is the only program in this proposed Measure that is recommended to receive funding to cover all the needs submitted by the cities. Joe Hurley indicated that, in reality, the bike/ped facilities will receive much more than the recommended 3% because other highway projects such as the auxiliary lane projects also include bike/ped components. Member Larson suggested that fact be highlighted in order for the Measure to “speak” to the public and emphasize that point.

Motion: To have received the report as presented, and return in January 2004 with a total look at Measure “A” and its 4 areas of expenditure. Roberts/Bigelow, unanimous.

6 Adjournment.

At 4:39 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.